



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/735,823	12/16/2003	Kil-soo Jung	1793.1146	2874
49455 7590 11/13/2008 STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP 1400 EYE STREET, NW SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20005				
EXAMINER				
CHIO, TAT CHI				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2621				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/13/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/735,823

Applicant(s)

JUNG ET AL.

Examiner

TAT CHI CHIO

Art Unit

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-2 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-2 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 2 of copending Application No. 10/735,850. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the apparatus of the instant application can be operated by the method of the copending application.

Consider claim 1, an apparatus for reproducing motion picture data for different angles corresponding to a motion picture from an information storage medium, the apparatus comprising: a reading unit which reads clip audio video (AV) streams corresponding to the motion picture data for different angles, the clip AV streams being interleaved with respect to each other, from the information storage medium; and a reproduction unit which reproduces the clip AV streams according to clip information corresponding to the clip AV streams provided in a separate area of the information storage medium from that of the interleaved clip AV streams, wherein each unit of clip information comprises an entry point map comprising information on entry points of a corresponding one of the clip AV streams for random access, and information on whether each of the entry points is an angle change point, wherein the angle change point is a point through which the motion picture is reproduced from one angle to another angle, wherein the reproduction unit jumps at the entry point of the clip AV streams from one angle to another angle if the entry point is the angle change point using the information on entry points and the information on whether each of the entry points is an angle change point.

Claim 1 of the instant application is conflicting with claim 1 of the copending application, which directs to the method of operating the apparatus of claim 1 of the instant application.

Consider claim 2, an apparatus, wherein the information on whether each of the entry points is an angle change point comprises location information of the entry points among the AV stream.

Claim 2 of the instant application is conflicting with claim 2 of the copending application, which directs to the method of operating the apparatus of claim 1 of the instant application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

1. Claims 1-2 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 10 and 11 of copending Application No. 10/735,819 in view of Nakai et al. (5,999,698). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because:

Consider claim 1, claim 10 of the copending application recites an apparatus for reproducing motion picture data for different angles corresponding to a motion picture from an information storage medium, the apparatus comprising: a reading unit which reads clip AV streams corresponding to the motion picture data for different angles, the clip AV streams being interleaved with respect to each other, from the information storage medium; and a reproduction unit which reproduces the clip AV streams according to clip information corresponding to the clip AV streams provided in a separate area of the information storage medium from that of the interleaved clip AV streams, wherein each unit of clip information comprises an entry point map comprising information on entry points of a corresponding one of the clip AV streams for random access, and information on whether each of the entry points is an angle change point, wherein the angle change point is a point through which the motion picture is

reproduced from one angle to another angle. However, claim 10 of the copending application does not explicitly teach the reproduction unit jumps at the entry point of the clip AV streams from one angle to another angle if the entry point is the angle change point using the information on entry points and the information on whether each of the entry points is an angle change point.

Nakai et al. teach the reproduction unit jumps at the entry point of the clip AV streams from one angle to another angle if the entry point is the angle change point using the information on entry points and the information on whether each of the entry points is an angle change point (col. 56, lines 5-11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a reproduction unit to jump at the entry point of the clip AV streams from one angle to another angle to provide user with seamless angle change.

Consider claim 2, claim 11 of the copending application recites the apparatus, wherein the information on whether each of the entry points is an angle change point comprises location information of the entry points among the AV streams. It is noted that claim 2 of the instant application is broader than claim 11 of the copending application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikuchi et al. (5870523) in view of Nakai et al. (5,999,698).

Consider claim 1, Kikuchi teaches an apparatus for reproducing motion picture data for different angles corresponding to a motion picture from an information storage medium, the apparatus comprising: a reading unit which reads clip audio video (AV) streams corresponding to the motion picture data for different angles from the information storage medium (Fig. 1 and Fig. 37); and a reproduction unit which reproduces the clip AV streams according to clip information corresponding to the clip AV streams provided in a separate area of the information storage medium from that of the clip AV streams (Fig. 6, Fig. 25, and Fig. 26. The video information is stored in a different pack from the PCI and DSI data. Therefore, the examiner considers that the clip AV streams and the clip information are stored in a separate area.), wherein each unit of clip information comprises an entry point map comprising information on entry points of a corresponding one of the clip AV streams for random access (col. 27, lines 5-44), and information on whether each of the entry points is an angle change point, wherein the angle change point is a point through which the motion picture is reproduced from one angle to another angle (Fig. 37, step s23, Fig. 40, step s43, col.

27, lines 5-44), wherein the reproduction unit jumps at the entry point of the clip AV streams from one angle to another angle if the entry point is the angle change point using the information on entry points and the information on whether each of the entry points is an angle change point (Fig. 37, step s23, Fig. 40, step s43, col. 27, lines 5-44), but Kikuchi does not explicitly teach that the clip AV streams being interleaved with respect to each other.

Nakai teaches the clip AV streams being interleaved with respect to each other (col. 21, lines 59-66). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the clip AV streams interleaved with respect to each other to facilitate seamless angle change.

Consider claim 2, Kikuchi teaches the apparatus, wherein the information on whether each of the entry points is an angle change point comprises location information of the entry points among the AV stream (col. 27, lines 5-44).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TAT CHI CHIO whose telephone number is (571)272-9563. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 9:00 AM-5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thai Tran can be reached on (571)-272-7382. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/T. C. C./
Examiner, Art Unit 2621

/Thai Tran/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2621